

Appl. No. 10/805,707

Remarks

Reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments to the claims and the following Remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claim 25 has been amended and claims 29-31 have been canceled herein, thus claims 25-28 and 32-40 are pending for the Examiner's consideration.

Claims 25-40 and claims 29-31 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Claims 25-40 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Amend et al. (US2003/0183053).

Rejections Under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 25-40 and claims 29-31 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 29-31 have been canceled herein thus the Examiner's rejections of these claims have been rendered moot. Claim 25 has been amended herein to further clarify the invention. In particular the claim has been amended to clearly recite that projections in the spaced zones include projections previously introduced in the claim, in other words the projections in the spaced zones are a subset of the projections previously introduced in the claim language. In view of the above it is submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102

Claims 25-40 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Amend et al. (US2003/0183053). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action the Examiner contends that the Amend publication discloses all of the features of the claimed invention. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. The claimed invention as set forth in claim 25 recites a method for impressing a material including the step of "providing a die having a plurality of adjacently arranged fields, each of

Appl. No. 10/805,707

said fields having at least two distinct projections, each field arranged to engage the material substantially simultaneously." Claim 25 further recites that "selected ones of said plurality of fields have a plurality of spaced zones, each of said spaced zones having including a plurality of said projections, and wherein each of said spaced zones are separated from each other by an area without projections". In other words, selected fields on the die have areas of projections that are spaced from other areas of projections within the same field, each of these areas of projections are spaced from one another by an area that is free of projections. It is respectfully submitted that a close review of the cited reference reveals that the reference fails to disclose such a structure.

The Amend publication appears to disclose a rotary knife assembly including a bearing ring 20 wherein the bearing ring includes notches 32 at selected locations along the bearing ring 20. Thus, it does not appear as if the ring 20 includes a "plurality of adjacent arranged fields" wherein "each field has at least two distinct projections". Stated another way, the ring 20 appears to be continuous so it is not seen how the ring 20 includes at least two projections. The Examiner further contends that "Amend discloses creating cross-hatched projections/zones to control the contact area". (Office Action, p. 3, citing paragraphs [0048-0051]). Initially it is not clear that the "cross hatch pattern 52" identified at paragraph [0048] of Amend includes at "least two distinct projections" of the type claimed. Nonetheless, even if the Examiner contends that the cross hatch pattern 52 includes at least two distinct patterns it is not seen how the roll described in Amend can be construed to include a "plurality of *adjacent* arranged fields" wherein "each field has at least two distinct projections" in the manner claimed. In particular it is noted that the two "cross hatch pattern 52" areas identified in Fig. 5 of Amend are not adjacently arranged but are rather arranged in spaced relationship. With regard to the ring 20 it is not seen how such ring 20 includes at least two projections as recited in the claim.

In view of the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that Amend fails to anticipate the claimed invention at least for the reasons set forth above.

Appl. No. 10/805,707

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the amended claim in light of the above remarks and an early Notice of Allowance are courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney at the below-listed number.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 10-0750/CAN-5004-USANP/PJH.

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul J. Higgins/

Paul Higgins
Reg. No. 44,152
Attorney for Applicants

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-1728
Dated: October 4, 2007